EXHIBIT 62

Message
_____

From: incognito-team@google.com [incognito-team@google.com]
on behalf of Chris Palmer [palmer@google.com]
Sent: 9/25/2014 6:12:05 PM
To: Daniel Connelly [dconnelly@google.com]
CC: Garth Shoemaker [garths@google.com]; Stephan Somogyi [somogyi@google.com]; Mustafa Emre Acer
                  [meacer@google.com]; Joel Weinberger [jww@google.com]; Dominic Battre [battre@google.com]; Jason Woloz
                  [jwoloz@google.com]; Security-PR [security-pr@google.com]; chrome-security [chrome-security@google.com];
                  Chrome Privacy [chrome-privacy@google.com]; incognito-team [incognito-team@google.com]; Martin Ortlieb
                  [mortlieb@google.com]; Pauline Anthonysamy [anthonysp@google.com]
Subject: Re: [incognito-team] Re: I promise this is my last rant about Incognito :)

On Thu, Sep 25, 2014 at 6:15 AM, Daniel Connelly <dconnelly@google.com> wrote:

> I think we all agree that we have a user education problem that we've found
> difficult to address. But throwing up our hands and declaring failure, when
> all we've done is dump some text in front of users and expect them to read
> it, is, at a minimum, rash and short-sighted. Lots of research has been done
> in usability and user education, and "give them a user manual" isn't exactly
> cutting-edge.

I'm not throwing up my hands and declaring failure. I'm saying that
our (admirably clear, concise, and accurate) documentation is at odds
with the name and icon, and at odds with what an executive says in an
acute adversarial scenario. Therefore, we need to harmonize the name +
icon, our statements in the press, and our documentation.

The documentation is correct; the implied guarantee of the name + icon
— which we know, from painful experience, users *do* perceive and
expect — is impossible to achieve. Therefore we should harmonize the
name + icon *down*. So that we don't deceive users, and so that users
have less self-deception.

> Lots of things are poorly understood yet provide real value; this is not
> new. The world is full of ambiguity, and us taking away toys because people
> don't completely understand them isn't a user-respectful solution.

I'm not saying that we take away the feature of RAM-backed profile
data storage; I'm saying that we should label it correctly.

>> The high-order bits are the name "Incognito", and the Spy Guy icon.
>> Incognito is, regardless of whatever words we say, the Spy Mode that
>> James Bond would use. If people are only going to "read" 1 or 2 bits
>> of information, it's going to be those bits.
>
> I suspect that neither re-branding nor re-iconing will have any effect. It's
> been more than five years.

Yes, five years of conflict between the high-order bits and the
reality of the feature. Five years of users filing confused (and
sometimes angry) bug reports. Five years of people operating under a
false sense of privacy.

The Incognito name and the Spy Guy icon were cheeky and fun when
Chrome was new and directed at power users. Now Chrome is used by 1
billion people from all sorts of backgrounds, speaking all sorts of
languages. Cheeky doesn't translate well, and fun is not very fun when
a true perception of privacy is the make-or-break feature for cloud
services.

GOOG-BRWN-00457255

PRODBEG: GOOG-BRWN-00457255
PRODBEGATT:
PRODEND: GOOG-BRWN-00457255
PRODENDATT:
PRODVOL: PROD032
2nd_CROSS_BEGBATES:
2nd_CROSS_ENDBATES:
AllCustodians: Justin Schuh;Sabine Borsay
TO: daniel connelly <dconnelly@google.com>
FROM: chris palmer <palmer@google.com>
CC: chrome-security <chrome-security@google.com>;chrome privacy <chrome-privacy@-
        google.com>;stephan somogyi <somogyi@google.com>;garth shoemaker
        <garths@google.com>;dominic battre <battre@google.com>;joel weinb-
        erger <jww@google.com>;mustafa emre acer <meacer@google.com>;jaso-
        n woloz <jwoloz@google.com>;security-pr <security-pr@google.com>;-
        incognito-team <incognito-team@google.com>;pauline anthonysamy <a-
        nthonysp@google.com>;martin ortlieb <mortlieb@google.com>
BCC:
CONFIDENTIALITY: Confidential
CROSS_ALLCUSTODIANS: Justin Schuh;Sabine Borsay
CROSS_ATTACHMENTNAME:
CROSS_BEGATTACH:
CROSS_BEGBATES: GOOG-CABR-00351102
CROSS_CC: chrome-security <chrome-security@google.com>;chrome privacy <chrome-pr-
        ivacy@google.com>;stephan somogyi <somogyi@google.com>;garth shoe-
        maker <garths@google.com>;dominic battre <battre@google.com>;joel-
         weinberger <jww@google.com>;mustafa emre acer <meacer@google.com-
        >;jason woloz <jwoloz@google.com>;security-pr <security-pr@google-
        .com>;incognito-team <incognito-team@google.com>;pauline anthonys-
        amy <anthonysp@google.com>;martin ortlieb <mortlieb@google.com>
CROSS_CONFIDENTIALITY: CONFIDENTIAL
CROSS_CUSTODIAN: Sabine Borsay
CROSS_DATECREATED:
CROSS_DATEMOD: 09/25/2014
CROSS_DATERECEIVED: 09/25/2014
CROSS_DATESENT: 09/25/2014
CROSS_DE-DUPED CUSTODIANS: Justin Schuh;Sabine Borsay
CROSS_ENDATTACH:
CROSS_ENDBATES: GOOG-CABR-00351102
CROSS_FILEEXTENSION: eml
CROSS_FILENAME:
CROSS_FROM: chris palmer <palmer@google.com>
CROSS_MD5 HASH: FA8AA8A17EEBC0601A02BF70D611F592
CROSS_MESSAGE ID: <CAOuvq23utNHVodkN_J=y6b3F3LqRdtDiieooxM1PGRXSVaVOsQ@mail.gmai-
        l.com>
CROSS_OWNER: palmer
CROSS_PRODVAL: CROSS-PROD002
CROSS_REDACTED: N
CROSS_SUBJECT: Re: [incognito-team] Re: I promise this is my last rant about Inc-
        ognito :)
CROSS_TITLE: Re: [incognito-team] Re: I promise this is my last rant about Incog-
        nito :)
CROSS_TO: daniel connelly <dconnelly@google.com>
CUSTODIAN/SOURCE: Sabine Borsay
DATECREATED:

DATELASTMOD: 09/25/2014
DATERCVD:
DATESENT:
DeDupedCustodians:
DOCEXT:
FILENAME:
ILS_ProdDate: 07/31/2021
CROSS_ILS_ProdDate: 09/01/2021
MD5 HASH: FA8AA8A17EEBC0601A02BF70D611F592
MessageID:
NATIVEFILE:
Owner: palmer
PAGES:
REDACTED: N
SUBJECT: Re: [incognito-team] Re: I promise this is my last rant about Incognito-
        :)